

April 1, 2004

## INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TPM 20702, ER Log No. 02-20-001, Van Cleve Tentative Parcel Map

2. Description of Project:

The project proposes a Tentative Parcel Map for a 51.9-acre parcel in the Multiple Species Conservation Program area. The split would create two parcels; each with graded pads for single-family residence (groundwater dependent) and the eastern parcel will have a horse corral. The western parcel contains an existing pad and building used for equipment storage. The project proposes 2,200 cubic yards of soil to be moved in the grading of the sites that will affect 4 acres.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Russel Van Cleve  
19491 Deerhorn Valley Road  
Jamul, CA 91935

4. Project Location:

19491 Deerhorn Valley Road  
Jamul, CA 91935

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1314, Grid 1/G

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The surrounding land use is residential. The subject parcel contains native vegetation (Dense Coast Live Oak Woodland, Northern Mixed Chaparral, and Valley and Foothill Grassland). There are natural drainage features on site. The site also has many rock outcroppings and large free standing boulders.

6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Jamul-Dulzura  
Land Use Designation: 18 – Multiple Rural Use  
Density: 1 du/ 4, 8, 20 acre(s)
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A72  
Density: .125 du/ 8 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: N/A
8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached “Environmental Analysis Form”.  
  
Biological Resources
9. Lead Agency Name and Address:  
  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650  
San Diego, California 92123-1666
10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:  
  
Mario Covic, Environmental Analyst (858) 694-3055
11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:  

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Tentative Parcel Map	County of San Diego
12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:  
  
State of California Department of Fish & Game
13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:  
  
Mario Covic, Environmental Analyst  
Stephanie Hall, Project manager
14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

MARIO COVIC, Environmental Analyst  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
Regulatory Planning

Date: April 1, 2004

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: April 1, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Van Cleve Tentative Parcel Map

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TPM 20702, Log No. 02-20-001

### EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

**"Potentially Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

**"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

**"Less Than Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

**"Not Applicable."** County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

### I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 1.4 (RDA) Rural Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designation (18) Estate. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4, 8 or 20 acres depending on the average slope of each proposed parcel. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan because, each proposed parcel is greater than 20 acres gross. The project is subject to the policies of the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Jamul/Dulzura Subregional Plan. The current zone is A72 Use Regulation, which require a net minimum lot size of 8 acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is developed with estate residential. To the east, west and north are residential land uses and to the south are vacant parcels. The proposed project is for a residential land use proposing .24 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, this project will be compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is a minor subdivision, which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or

other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

## II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site and adjacent parcels do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. In addition, the proposed project site does not support prime agricultural soils, as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Therefore, no adverse impacts to resources included in this program or on prime agricultural soils will occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

### **Not Applicable.**

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. In addition, the project and surrounding area are not zoned for agricultural use, nor is the land under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

**Not Applicable.**

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

**III. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not displace existing residential uses because the site is vacant. The addition of 2 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

**IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES**

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Mario Covic on December 5, 2002, did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Vista rocky coarse sandy and Cienega very rocky coarse. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse potential for development activity.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

On a site visit completed by Mario Covic on December 5, 2002 no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**



The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). Also, on a site visit conducted by Mario Covic on December 5, 2002, no past or present mining activities were identified on the project.

## V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

**Not Applicable.**

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

The project lies in the Hollenbeck hydrologic subarea, within the Otay hydrologic unit - that is impaired for ***Coliform bacteria***.

The project proposes grading and construction that could contribute the following pollutants: sediment, oils and construction debris. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed as required by the WPO. Potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: proper waste management, silt fences and fiber rolls which address the siltation and construction debris.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is groundwater dependent and will not rely on imported water.

4. Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

**Yes.**

The project is outside the County Water Authority boundary. In addition a minor SWMP received 4-18-03 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources. In addition, a preliminary CEQA drainage study received 11-25-03 by DPLU has been reviewed and accepted for CEQA purposes by DPW.

6. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or substantially increase the amount of runoff that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources. In addition, a preliminary CEQA drainage study received 11-25-03 by DPLU has been reviewed and accepted for CEQA purposes by DPW.

7. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not substantially create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources. In addition, a preliminary CEQA drainage study received 11-25-03 by DPLU has been reviewed and accepted for CEQA purposes by DPW.

8. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Hollenbeck hydrologic subarea, within the Otay hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water:

**Municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; Industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.**

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: proper waste management, silt fences and fiber rolls which address the siltation and construction debris.

9. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less Than Significant Impact:**

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: proper waste management, silt fences and fiber rolls which address the siltation and construction debris.

10. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

As identified within Section 67.722B of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance, it has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability.

11. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will obtain its water supply from onsite domestic wells. Section 67.722 A, 1 of the Ordinance identifies the residential density controls for parcel maps. The project is proposing an average residential density of one dwelling unit per 26 acres. The Groundwater Ordinance stipulates a minimum parcel size of 8 acres, since the project area receives between 15 and 18 inches of annual precipitation. The proposed project, at the average density of one dwelling unit per 26 acres, clearly meets this density requirement. It has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability.

The project proposes to increase the amount of impervious surfaces onsite to approximately 3.8% of the total site area. This should not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

12. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

**Yes.**

As identified within Section 67.722B of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance, it has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability.

## **VI. AIR QUALITY**

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 10 Average Daily Trips (ADT) per single family residence. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Based on a site visit conducted on December 5, 2002, by Mario Covic, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

**VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION**

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will generate 24 ADT which (per SANDAG traffic rates 2 lots times 12 ADT per lot = 24 ADT) is not a significant increase to the existing traffic on Deerhorn Valley Road. Currently there is approximately 1,200 ADT on Deerhorn Valley Road. The existing level of service on Deerhorn Valley Road is better than "C". The level of service with the project will be better than level of service "C". Deerhorn Valley Road when built out to its classification (Residential Collector Road) can handle 4,500 ADT at Level of Service "C."

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

There are no potentially significant impacts to traffic safety since the proposed project will be required to provide adequate sight distance in both directions along Deerhorn Valley Road from the project entrance road.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not result in hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists since no hazards or barriers are proposed.

**VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**

No threatened, endangered, or narrow endemic species were detected on the project site and the site does not include habitat for key regional populations of covered species. One sensitive plant species, the Engelmann Oak was observed onsite. Although most specimens are not within the proposed open space easement, it is not anticipated that these trees will be removed as a result of this project. Two sensitive species, the red-tailed hawk and the western bluebird were observed onsite and the turkey vulture has a high potential to occur as it was observed soaring over an adjacent site. However, due to the project design including: placing development towards the northern property boundary close to the existing private road access easement where there are existing uses and disturbances; and, the conservation of a large block of habitat (34.86 acres) within an open space easement, developing the site will not significantly impact an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Yes.**

Sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Mario Covic on December 5, 2002. However, the project will not complete any development, grading, grubbing, clearing, or any other activity that will damage the sensitive habitat lands. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site contains a small, natural ephemeral stream that is surrounded by dense coast live oak woodland and flows offsite to the north. The ephemeral stream is classified as a wetland under County, State and Federal jurisdiction. The entire wetland and wetland buffer along with the associated dense coast live oak woodland habitat is protected within an open space easement. Therefore, there are no impacts proposed to wetlands as a result of this project. The project is in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site contains an ephemeral stream that will not be impacted, and the proposed development will not discharge into and/or restrict or divert the movement of any known watershed including, but not limited to, rivers, lakes, streams, creeks, channels, or wetlands where the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over. The project proposes complete avoidance of all jurisdictional waters and wetlands by placing these watersheds in a biological open space easement with an appropriate biological buffer of at least 25 feet. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or watersheds that are California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional waters.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**

The site is surrounded by undeveloped lands to the east, south and west. The open space design conserves a 34.86-acre block of habitat that is



adjacent and contiguous to this undeveloped land. The easement includes the most sensitive habitats onsite such as dense coast live oak woodland and RPO wetland and seventy percent of the southern mixed chaparral onsite. In addition, the easement includes a variety of topographical features, such as drainages, portions of the site that are relatively flat, as well as the portions that tend to be steep. This will allow for avian species and small animals and even wide ranging species such as mule deer, mountain lion and golden eagle (rated with a moderate potential to occur onsite) to continue using the site for foraging and as a local wildlife corridor.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

**Yes.**

Please refer to Findings Of Conformance Multiple Species Conservation Program for the Van Cleve Tentative Parcel Map TPM 20702, Log No. 02-20-001.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project and any off-site improvements are located within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

## **IX. HAZARDS**

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Not applicable:**

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have

contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

**Not Applicable.**

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter, dated 9/18/02, has been received from the San Diego Rural Fire Protection District.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or substantially increase the amount of runoff that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources. In addition, a preliminary CEQA drainage study received 11-25-03 by DPLU has been reviewed and accepted for CEQA purposes by DPW.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is not located in a floodway or floodplain as defined in the resource protection ordinance.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Not Applicable.**

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Not Applicable.**

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

**Not Applicable.**

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Not Applicable.**

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

**X. NOISE**

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposal would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposal would not generate potentially significant adverse noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise

Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

## **XI. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: San Diego Rural Fire Protection District will provide fire services. The service letter is based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies. The project proposes the use of on-site sewer systems and wells. The schools indicate that the project is eligible for service. Deerhorn Valley Road, an existing 50-foot wide public road, access the project; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

## **XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES**

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;  
Communications systems;  
Water treatment or distribution facilities;  
Sewer or septic tanks;  
Storm water drainage;  
Solid waste disposal;  
Water supplies?

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project will not result in the need for new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project.

**XIII. AESTHETICS**

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

**NO.**

The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area, in terms of vividness and intactness, will not be impacted since the proposed use will be similar to the existing surrounding use. .

The proposed project is minor land subdivision, which will subsequently result in the addition of two new single-family residences. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: The surrounding area is residential, so a viewer sees single-family residences on both sides of Deer Springs Road. The new single-family residences will also be partially screened from the existing Eucalyptus trees along the western slope of the project site.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**YES**

The average slope for the property is 40.95 percent gradient. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are steep slopes on the property however, an open space easement is proposed over the entire steep slope lands. Therefore, the project is in conformance with the RPO.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

**XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Staff has reviewed and accepted the cultural resources report titled, "An Archaeological Survey of the Van Cleve Tentative Parcel Map Project, San Diego County, California", dated November 2003 and prepared by Andrew R. Pignuolo with James & Briggs Archaeological Services. The 51.87-acre parcel was surveyed in January 2003. Four cultural resources sites and one isolated artifact were identified. One site, CA-SDI-16790, contained a more extensive series of bedrock milling features along with associated artifacts and is recommended to be preserved in an open space easement. The boundary of the site was determined, along with a 10-foot buffer, to delineate the open space easement. The boundary determination at this site established that a subsurface deposit is present and that an existing road on the western margin of the site will need to be adjusted to avoid the open space easements.

The other three sites (CA-SDI-16789, CA-SDI-16791 and CA-SDI-16792) were tested for significance and were found to have no subsurface features or artifacts. Consequently, they do not contain the potential for further research and lack qualities that would make them eligible for

nomination to the California Register or as significant under RPO. No further cultural resource work is necessary to address these three resources. In addition, because the project does not include development of areas of significant alluvial deposits that might conceal archaeological sites, construction monitoring of the remaining property is not necessary.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Yes.**

The property has been surveyed by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist, Andrew R. Pignolo, and it has been determined there is one (or more) archaeological/historical site(s). Testing and other investigation determined that one of the archaeological/historical sites does meet the definition of significant site. The project complies with the Resource Protection Ordinance because the significant site (extensive series of bedrock milling features along with associated artifacts) will be preserved in an open space easement and a 10-foot buffer.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
- a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
  - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
  - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
  - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
  - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

**Less Than Significant Impact**



The staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, has examined the archaeological and/or historical resources present on the property and determined the site have archaeological or historical significance. The site will be preserved through the dedication of open space easement including permanent fencing. The open space easement will preserve the site, thus, the potential impacts of the project are mitigated.

**XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE**

None.

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 6. and 7., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., 2., and 3., the project will not degrade the quality of the environment and will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

## **XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS**

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A.
3. Mitigation measures: N/A

**XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

Archaeology Survey and Evaluation of Cultural Resources for TPM 20702.

Prepared by Andrew Pignuolo, James and Briggs Archaeological Services.  
November 2003.

Biological Technical Report for TPM 20702. Prepared by Robin Church. March 2004.

CEQA Preliminary Hydrology Study for TPM 20702. Prepared by Edgar Monroy, P.E., RCE 27188, RTE 1432. April 2003

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division  
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,  
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego General Plan, Jamul-Dulzura Community Plan

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701 through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b, Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Regional Land Use Element, Part II

County of San Diego Scenic Highway Element, Part VI

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340, Parking Regulations, Section 6758)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, TPM 20702 ER Log No. 02-20-001. March 8, 2004

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology

ND04-04\0220001-ISF